R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 279 UD 002 504

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN REGULAR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY- PARKE, MARGARET B.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.04 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *REMEDIAL READING, *EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS, SPECIAL PROGRAMS, *EVALUATION, ASPIRATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, TEACHER EVALUATION, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

THE SUCCESS OF A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES TO EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN 130 NEW YORK CITY NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS WAS ASSESSED. THE AIM OF THE PROGRAM WAS TO STIMULATE THE STUDENTS' INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT AND TO RAISE THEIR EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION LEVELS. THE EVALUATION OF THE DATA FROM INCOMPLETE TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRES AND FROM CLASSROOM OBSERVATION WAS SEVERELY LIMITED BECAUSE THE PROGRAM STARTED LATE, RAN ONLY 1 TO 6 WEEKS, AND OFTEN LACKED APPROPRIATE MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT. THE AUTHOR RECOMMENDS THAT MUCH OF THE WORK OF THE DIRECTOR BE DELEGATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL AND THAT MORE CAREFULLY SELECTED SPECIAL TEACHERS BE GIVEN INTENSIVE TRAINING IN REMEDIAL TECHNIQUES. HOWEVER, IT WAS FOUND THAT THE PROJECT WAS RECEIVED FAVORABLY BY THE STAFF, AND IT IS FELT THAT IT SHOULD BE CONTINUED. INCLUDED IN THE REPORT ARE DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM INCLUDING MATERIALS, AND TEST DATA, AND DISCUSSIONS OF THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE PROGRAM WAS ACCEPTED BY THE PARENTS, TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND CHILDREN. (NC)

ED011279

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN REGULAR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Dr. Margaret B. Parke
Research Director

VD 002504

August 31, 1966

49p

VD 002504

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	Project Description	1
II	Objectives of Evaluation for 1965-66	3
III	Evaluation Procedures	4
IV	Results of the Survey	7
	A. Action toward the Realization of Project Objectives	7
	1. Teacher Background Data	8
	2. Teachers at Work	9
	3. The Workroom and Equipment	11
	4. Instructional Materials and Supplies	16
	5. Tests and Test Data	19
	B. Degree of Acceptance of the Program	20
	1. Principals	20
	2. Classroom Teachers	23
	3. Reading Teachers	24
	4. Children	24
	5. Parents	25
	6. Public and Non-Public School Relationships	25
	C. Future Prospects, Questions, and Suggestions	28
	1. Administration	29
	2. Selection and Placement of Teachers	31
	3. The Nature of Equipment and Materials	32
	4. Education and Supervision of Teachers	34
V.	Summary	37
VI.	Appendixes	
	Appendix A - Questionnaire to Principals	40
	Appendix B -- Questionnaire to Teachers	44
	Appendix C -- Observer's Report	47

AN INTERIM EVALUATION OF THE CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS FOR 1965-66

The program of Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Regular Day Schools is an attempt on the part of the Board of Education of the City of New York, with the help of NDEA funds, to provide special diagnostic and remedial help for educationally disadvantaged children in one hundred thirty private and parochial schools in impacted poverty neighborhoods in the five boroughs of the city. Children in such schools come from different ethnic groups and generally lack the help or tutoring available in the homes of middle-class children. The project, therefore, tries to compensate for the lack of opportunity created by social and economic conditions. Since the existence of severe reading deficiencies seems to be a barrier to integration, an effort is being made to ameliorate or eliminate some specific factors which retard integration and so promote integration and social interaction with peers.

The major objective set forth for the project in the original application was to stimulate the educational aspirations and achievement of pupils in disadvantaged areas. The specific objectives were:

To increase proficiency in reading by providing corrective reading services.

To increase general achievement and motivation for school work by improvement of the reading skills.

To provide specialized material of instruction.

To provide diagnostic testing services.

To provide demonstration teaching sessions for the teachers in the non-public schools to acquaint them with the latest techniques.

To improve attendance patterns by improving school success.

The plan called for:

Ninety-three corrective reading teachers to work with approximately 13,950 children - a pupil ratio of 150 per teacher. A Project Application List indicated the borough, school code, name of school, address, grade span, kinds of supply lists to be sent.

A diagnostic testing program to be jointly developed by the non-public schools and the assigned reading specialists.

Small groups to be taught by the special reading teachers in separate rooms.

Consultation and demonstration services by the special reading teachers to aid the regular classroom teachers and to enhance and propagate the corrective work.

Kits of materials and equipment to be sent to schools. The Kit Lists listed the following:

Kit A for every school in the project to consist of such items as: teacher's desk and chair, round library-type table with chairs to use around it, bookcases, file cabinet, coat locker, chalkboard on portable stand with erasers and chalk, large ruler, bulletin board, metal storage chest, chart rack and paper, pencil sharpener, clips, thumb tacks, pointer, composition books, different kinds of paper, index cards, a rexograph machine with master units and duplicating fluid.

Kit B for every school regardless of size: American College Dictionary, Reading Laboratory IA for levels 1-3, Reading Laboratory IIA for levels 2-7, Macmillan Spectrum of Skills and Macmillan Spectrum of Books Set B, 1 set of Young Owl Books, 1 set of Little Owl Books, and 1 set of Wise Owl Books, 2 copies of Sequential Levels of Reading Growth.

Kit C to be sent in accordance with the number of corrective reading children per school, namely one Kit C for a school with 40-89 corrective reading children and two for a school with more than 90. These include one each of selected Reader's Digest Reading Skill Builder Books for Grades 2-6 plus a Teacher's Edition and five each of certain of these books, one package of upper primary reading tests and one package of Metropolitan Achievement Tests at the Primary,

Elementary, and Intermediate Levels, five each of 10 of the Follett Beginning to Read Books, five each of 20 books from Benefic Press, and five each of 18 books of the Practice Book type from McGraw-Hill Book Company.

OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION FOR 1965-66

Plans for an interim evaluation of the project, formulated during the first week in May, were influenced by the status of the project at that time and by suggestions for evaluation contained in the original contract. When evaluation was scheduled to begin, the first teachers were being assigned to schools. Materials and equipment were in the process of being ordered and sent to schools. June 10 was set as the last date for observers on this project to visit schools.

In view of the circumstances, it seemed important for an interim report to be concerned with:

The extent to which an attempt was made to realize the objectives and to carry out the plans advanced in the project application.

The degree of acceptance of the program.

Future prospects and suggestions for improvement.

Evaluation at this stage should attempt to make discoveries that will assist the project to move ahead as smoothly as possible. Suggestions in the original program for testing children to ascertain the extent to which achievement in reading and other school subjects had been influenced by the project were not pertinent at this time since a program that would warrant such extensive testing had not been in operation.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A simple but practical plan of evaluation evolved. A Questionnaire to Principals (Appendix A) was sent to all principals on the original list of schools compiled by the Board of Education. A Questionnaire to Teachers (Appendix B) was sent to all teachers on the Board of Education payroll for Corrective Reading Teachers in Non-Public Schools for May plus additional teachers reported by the administrative office or by principals to have been added in June. The questionnaire to principals attempted to discover:

Which schools had been assigned reading teachers and for what length of time

How many pupils were tested by the reading teacher and how many were selected for teaching

What remedial or useful materials and equipment for reading instruction the schools had on hand prior to receiving the kits to be used on this project and what new materials and equipment had been received

What kind of working space was available in the school for the reading teacher and her pupils

What standard test scores were available on school record cards in the areas of intelligence, reading and the other language arts as well as in the content areas

Each principal's reaction to the project, comments regarding it, and recommendations for future development

The questionnaire to reading teachers was concerned with:

Employment: weeks served, number of schools, and days per week in each school

Background: license held, age, years taught, background for teaching reading in terms of college and in-service courses taken, and experience in the corrective reading field.

Use of paid time: teaching; testing; being instructed; conferring with teachers, principal, or parents re children to be instructed; preparing for classwork and doing research; doing clerical work; ordering and distributing supplies and equipment; setting up a room and organizing materials;

giving instruction to classroom teachers; demonstrating; or speaking to community groups

Record-keeping procedures

Reaction to the project

Suggestions for improvement of the project

Within the time available, much effort was exerted to obtain questionnaires from all participating reading teachers and principals. Phone calls were made and second questionnaires were sent when necessary. The assistance of key people was sought in reaching those who were hard to contact.

To insure more intensive study of selected schools, observers were sent to ten schools to which teachers had been assigned. At the time that teachers were selected for visitation, there were 40 on the list. Therefore, every fourth one on the payroll list was visited. Each of five assistant professors and college teachers of reading visited two schools. The observer's mission was to confer with the principal of the school and the reading teacher and to speak with one group of children in a corrective reading class. He studied the questionnaires from the teacher and principal of the school and related facts gained from conferences and talks with children. Then he wrote a report and conferred with the investigator in accordance with the following outline:

Conference with principal: attitude toward the program, needs, progress

Conference with teacher: number of children tested, selected; basis of selection; conditions in the workroom; materials available; review of records; attitude toward the program, schools, pupils; needs; progress

Discussion with a representative group of children taught by the reading teacher re their purposes in working with

the teacher, what they have been doing, what they would like to do next year, and what their parents say about this project

Summary comments (See Appendix C for Observer's Report):

An analysis was then made of all questionnaire data and of observer's reports by the investigator with the clerical assistance of two graduate fellows.

Limitations in this study must be recognized. In the first place, the project had not been developed far enough to warrant the extensive type of evaluation which had been proposed originally. Secondly, the pressure to organize an evaluation project and complete it before schools closed prohibited adequate conferences with the Director of the project who was under even greater pressure to accomplish as much as possible. Thirdly, kit lists were not in the hands of the investigator at the time questionnaires were written. Such knowledge would have been invaluable at that time and would have changed some items on one questionnaire. Fourthly, in spite of the effort to have all questionnaires returned, approximately 9 per cent of them were missing at the time the report was written. Schools were closed, people were out of the city and could no longer be reached or if they were reached, they lacked the information needed.

The random sampling of observed schools appears to give a representative sampling of reactions presented in the questionnaires in general.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Information and insights gained from questionnaires to teachers and principals and from the conferences and reports of observers are organized here under the three objectives set forth for this evaluation on page 3. Forty teachers completed the Questionnaire to Teachers. Of the 131 schools on the Project Application List, one was known to have dropped out. Of the remaining 130 schools, questionnaires were received from 40 principals to whom reading teachers had been assigned and 80 principals who were without such teachers. A total of 120 principals responded.

ACTION TOWARD THE REALIZATION OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Obviously the project moved slowly at first, but as one reading teacher so aptly stated, "Once the project started, it was like spontaneous combustion -- everything happened fast." Between the first of May and the tenth of June, forty-four teachers were placed in forty-seven schools. This means that, in less than a month and a half, close to half of the anticipated number of teachers were employed and placed in more than a third of the listed schools. Much credit is due the Director of the project for this speedy progress. The teachers served from one to six weeks. Sixty-five per cent were employed for four weeks or more. They were in schools from one to three days a week. Three worked in two schools; the others served one school only. Ninety-five per cent of them spent two days per week in a school.

Since the reading teacher is the key to the program, much attention has been placed in this evaluation on a study of the reading teachers by means of the questionnaire to them and comments about them from principals and observers.

Teacher background data. According to the Questionnaires to Teachers, thirty-five or eighty-eight per cent were serving on substitute licenses. All but two of these held the Common Branches Substitute License and they operated on the Early Childhood Substitute License. Two held regular Early Childhood or Common Branches Licenses and three had licenses to teach elsewhere in the system.

In age, the teachers ranged from 25 to over 55. Twenty-three per cent were between 25 and 34; thirty-five per cent fell between 35 and 44; twelve per cent were between 45 and 54; and thirty per cent were 55 or above.

Variation in teaching experience, too, was wide. It ranged from two with no experience to four with 36 or more years. Sixteen or 40 per cent of them had from one to five years of experience. More than half had taught for more than six years.

As preparation to teach reading, one-fourth of them had no college credit in separate reading courses, whereas fifteen per cent had more than 10 credits. Eighty per cent had instruction in reading in integrated methods courses which they estimated to vary from two to ten credits in value. Sixteen had no in-service courses while two had as many as five. Fourteen had only one course and the others had two or three.

Half reported no experience in the corrective reading field. Thirteen had one year; the others had from two to five years.

Actually there is a considerable variation among these teachers in terms of license held, age, teaching experience, preparation to teach reading, and experience in the corrective reading field.

Teachers at Work. Tables I and II, made up from data on the questionnaires to principals, indicate that teachers tested a total of 1651 pupils and selected 1148 of them for their reading classes. These figures might well have been nine per cent higher if all of the serviced schools had returned questionnaires.

Table I
NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED FOR PLACEMENT IN CORRECTIVE READING CLASSES BY GRADES

Grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Pupils	70	288	367	343	301	230	46	6	1651

Table II
NUMBER OF PUPILS SELECTED FOR REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTION BY GRADES

Grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Pupils	72	222	266	218	212	115	36	7	1148

The tables represent very good effort for forty teachers in the short time they were on the job. However, it is important that these figures be compared with those the project was intended to serve. Ninety-three teachers were to work with 150 children each and serve 13,950 children. By this standard, more than ten times as many children should have been taught.

In general, the informal textbook inventory was used rather than standardized oral or diagnostic tests. This procedure would indicate

that the main purpose for testing was to ascertain the textbook level at which children should work and the difficulties encountered in using the textbook materials available in the school. Will commercial diagnostic tests be used in September? If so, where will teachers obtain them?

Table III, drawn from data on Questionnaires to Teachers indicates that all but two teachers spent considerable time testing children and that all but fourteen spent varying amounts of time in teaching. Half of them claimed to have no in-service instruction on paid time. Sixteen conferred with neither teachers nor principals, and more than half that number had no contact with parents. Again all of this might reasonably be expected in a project that started so late. There was some time spent preparing for classwork, doing clerical work and organizing a room. There is reason to believe that some teachers had no decent room to organize. Three conducted in-service instruction for teachers and two gave demonstration lessons. This is some indication that, given time, teachers will be able to help other classroom teachers. None of them spoke to community groups.

Table III
RATING OF RESPONSIBILITIES BY CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS

Responsibilities	Number of Teachers by Percentage of Time Devoted to Each Activity				
	no time	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Teaching children	14	6	7	3	10
Testing children	2	11	6	12	9
Being instructed in in-service programs	20	20			

TABLE III (continued)
RATING OF RESPONSIBILITIES BY CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS

Responsibilities	Number of Teachers by Percentage of Time Devoted to Each Activity				
	no time	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Conferring with children's teachers or principal	16	24			
Conferring with parents	31	8	1		
Preparing for classwork or doing research	16	20	4		
Doing clerical work or writing reports	9	27	4		
Ordering and/or distributing materials	27	13			
Organizing a room	20	20			
Conducting in-service instruction for teachers	37	3			
Giving demonstration lessons	38	2			
Speaking to community groups	40				

All but one teacher, who had been in the school only two days, kept records of some kind. Thirty-nine of them assumed responsibility for keeping a log of daily activities and teacher's attendance. Thirty-seven kept pupils' attendance. Thirty-five had records on test scores and the progress of each child. Only six kept a list of library books read by pupils. Observers noted that some teachers kept anecdotal records, though these were not referred to on the questionnaire, and they urged children to keep records of books they read. Some notes were rather disorganized. Others were brief and sketchy, while others were very careful records of progress.

The workroom and equipment. A satisfactory workroom provides the physical setting for the teacher's work and contributes to simplifying her tasks. It is an inviting place where children enjoy visiting and thus contributes to the establishment of atmosphere for reading.

Each school is responsible for providing a workroom. The Board of Education's responsibility is to send essential equipment for the room as outlined for Kit A. Does each school have an adequate workroom available? What did schools have before equipment was sent? Has the Board of Education furnished the promised equipment? Principals' replies to these questions are presented in Tables IV, V, and VI.

Table IV
WORKROOM FOR READING TEACHERS

	Schools with a Reading Teacher	Others	Total	Per Cent
One room is set aside for a corrective reading room. It is used for no other purposes.	16	15	31	26
One room is available for corrective reading on certain days or for certain periods of the day.	20	39	59	49
Cafeteria, halls, locker rooms or auditorium are to be used by the corrective reading teacher, but she will always work in the same place.	2	15	17	14
Working space shifts from one place to another during the day or week, but the place where children work is always free from other disturbances.	2	5	7	6
The only available space is a corner of a busy office or classroom.	0	6	6	5

Table IV shows that in twenty-six per cent of the schools a room is set aside as a corrective reading room to be used for no other purpose. This is an ideal situation, but more than most teachers can reasonably

expect if space is at a premium and they do not work in the school everyday. Forty-nine per cent of the schools can provide a room on certain days or for certain periods. A further check is necessary to discover if reading teachers are assigned on the specific days the rooms are available. One principal emphasized this need in these words:

> We are fortunate to have one small multi-purpose room available. Even this is insufficient on certain days. A nurse, remedial reading teacher, speech teacher and Hebrew teacher may compete for the room at one time.

The workroom space for the other fourth of the teachers is highly questionable. One principal described his situation in these words:

> Our school is overcrowded. Staffroom facilities are very limited. Since we have part-time sessions, it is not possible to take children for extra work.

Workrooms were analyzed in ways like this by the observers:

> Room is clean, moderately well lighted, airy, spacious enough with ample blackboard space and bulletin board.
>
> Small, unventilated room with no chalkboard and very little material; benches for children to sit on; no readers or library books in evidence.
>
> One classroom in which to teach and store materials with seats fastened to the floor; into it had been brought two large tables.
>
> Room is very old with old-type desks and seats; poor lighting; and not very clean.
>
> Room is noisy and generally ill-suited.
>
> Teacher shifts from nurse's room to art room to another small, poorly ventilated room and has great difficulty in keeping her working materials intact.

In a situation such as the last, it is natural that a teacher should ask, "Where are the desks, tables and chairs which are being sent to the schools to be placed?"

Storage space has been provided in Kit A. All principals may not know about this for one wrote:

> We lack adequately protected storage space for the equipment on order. Sufficient strong, metal lockers, shelves and closets should be provided for the materials sent. Otherwise, I feel they will not be safeguarded or accessible.

It is difficult to understand how a satisfactory program can be developed in twenty-five per cent of the schools unless some unique type of portable mobile of materials can be developed. Certainly these situations call for very special treatment if such schools remain in the project.

Table V is drawn from a section on the Questionnaire to Principals which asked what equipment the school had before the equipment for the corrective reading project arrived. The purpose of the question really was to discover what equipment was available as a guide to determining what might be included in a training program. If, for instance, all schools had television sets, then the training of class teachers might be done by television. Almost half would need television sets if this plan were used. If schools had overhead projectors, then attention might be directed to the preparation of transparencies for use in all schools. Figures show that less than two per cent have them so this procedure is not currently practical.

Table V
EQUIPMENT IN THE SCHOOL BEFORE EQUIPMENT FOR THIS PROJECT ARRIVED BY NUMBERS OF SCHOOLS POSSESSING EACH TYPE

	Schools with a Reading Teacher	Others	Total
Television	19	37	56
Rexograph	23	32	55
Typewriter for teacher use	12	32	44

Table V (continued)
EQUIPMENT IN THE SCHOOL BEFORE EQUIPMENT FOR THIS PROJECT ARRIVED BY NUMBERS OF SCHOOLS POSSESSING EACH TYPE

	Schools with a Reading Teacher	Others	Total
Primer typewriter for teacher use	1	4	5
Opaque projector	2	4	6
Overhead projector and transparencies	3	13	16
Record player alone or with earphones; records useful in teaching reading, literature, and spelling	19	31	50
Tape recorder and tapes	11	20	31
Machines for testing vision and hearing	0	2	2
Filmstrip projector	27	57	84
Movie projector	23	35	58
Radio	14	25	39

If teachers are to be taught to prepare their own materials for young children based on first-hand experiences, they need a typewriter with large type. Only five of these schools have primer typewriters. The variation among the schools in the type of equipment owned is very wide. The only piece of listed equipment that is owned by more than half of the schools is a filmstrip projector. Some schools have two portable TV sets for each floor while other schools do not have one for total school use. Buying for the schools obviously must take into account what each one has and what the specific needs are.

At the time the questionnaire was written, Kit A, B, and C lists were not in the hands of the investigator. Thus principals were not asked regarding all of the items on the kit lists. However, one item serves to give a clue to a question which has been raised by principals who want to have a part in ordering equipment and materials for their schools, and it may provide a significant sample item. A rexograph

machine was the only equipment item on both the questionnaire and Kit A List. Fifty-five principals or 46 per cent of the total number of respondents noted that they previously had a rexograph machine for teacher use. The advisability of ordering all items on a single list for every school should perhaps be considered.

Slowly equipment and materials have been arriving at the schools. Apparently kits did not arrive as units for principals referred to the "partial" arrival of kits. The compiled results in Table VI indicate the extent to which kits were partially or totally received.

Table VI
NUMBERS OF SCHOOLS THAT RECEIVED KITS OF EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS

Kits	A	B	C
Schools with a Reading Teacher	15		1
Others	39	6	7
Total	54	6	8

Materials arrived slowly in schools where reading teachers were placed as well as in schools without reading teachers. Less than half the schools had received materials in Kit A at the time the questionnaires arrived. Based on comments of observers, there is no assurance that principals were really sure about which materials were listed in each kit.

Instructional Materials and Supplies. The materials possessed by the teacher for use with children are recognized to be extremely important determiners of curriculum. Therefore, this item carries great weight in influencing the success of the project.

Table VII
MATERIALS USED FOR READING INSTRUCTION BEFORE THE PROJECT STARTED BY NUMBERS OF SCHOOLS

	Schools with a Reading Teacher	Others	Total
One set of basal readers per class	33	66	99
Two or more sets of basal readers per class	7	16	23
Library books in each classroom suited to the range of pupil abilities	16	42	58
A good supply of library books in a school library	11	17	28
Programmed materials such as SRA	14	41	55
A picture dictionary for each pupil in the primary grades	1	6	7
A regular dictionary in middle and upper grades for each pupil	11	14	25
Weekly and/or daily newspapers	20	42	62
Reading games, word cards, charts	14	28	42
A variety of diagnostic tests for teacher use	9	17	26

The following questions are raised: What did schools have prior to the project? What are they to receive? Table VII, compiled from answers to questions 8 on the Questionnaire to Principals, indicates that 99 of the 120 schools had one set of basal readers per class; 23 had two or more sets. Almost half claimed to have library books in each classroom suited to the range of abilities, but the number of these per pupil was not given nor requested. Less than a fourth of them claimed to have a good supply of library books in the school

library. In some cases, principals commented later in the questionnaire about the poor quality of those library books that were available. Fifty-five, slightly less than half, used programmed materials such as SRA.

One school to which a reading teacher had been assigned had a picture dictionary for each child in the primary grades; a total of seven of the project schools had them. Twenty-five of the 120 schools had dictionaries for each pupil in middle and upper grades. A Barnhart Edition of the American College Dictionary was placed on the kit list for each school. This presumably was intended for teacher use.

Sixty-two principals reported the use of weekly and daily newspapers; 42 noted the use of reading games, word cards and/or charts; and 26 indicated that a variety of diagnostic tests for teacher use were available.

A review of the materials listed in Kits A, B, and C and a comparison of those items with the Questionnaire to Principals raises the question which some principals and teachers have raised as to whether every school needs every item on the list. Perhaps some of the money could be better spent on essential items which schools do not have.

Kits appear to be weak in materials for children who read at the preprimer, primer, and first-grade reading levels. This weakness is probably what leads reading teachers to comment:

> We need lots of primer level materials even for 4-6 graders...We need a wide range of materials starting at the preprimer level....Even when the kits arrive, I don't believe they will contain the easy materials which I need.

Tests and test data. Table VIII, compiled from item 11 on the Questionnaire to Principals, shows the kind of test score data available to reading teachers in these schools. Intelligence tests were given in 98 schools, or more than eighty per cent of them. Only twenty-seven schools tested reading at the beginning and end of each term; 34 at the end of each term, and 49 at the end of certain terms.

Table VIII
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING STANDARD TEST SCORES AVAILABLE FOR EACH PUPIL

	Schools with a Reading Teacher	Others	Total
Intelligence	35	63	98
Reading			
Beginning and end of each term	6	21	27
End of each term	13	21	34
End of certain terms	18	31	49
Spelling	13	21	34
Handwriting	7	12	19
Composition	9	12	21
History, geography, and science	13	19	32
Mathematics	24	34	58

Reading, the other language arts, and the content areas of history, geography and science were given less emphasis in the testing programs of the schools than was mathematics. Generally, more attention was given to intelligence testing than to achievement testing.

Thus it is clear that the project is now well underway and that there has been rapid movement in May and June toward the realization of project objectives.

DEGREE OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROGRAM

The second major concern in the interim evaluation has been to ascertain how well the project is being received by principals, classroom teachers, reading teachers, children, and parents.

Principals. As might be expected, responses vary to the question, "What is your reaction to the corrective reading program?" Two-thirds of the responding principals had not seen a corrective reading teacher nor had they received many, if any, supplies. For them the answer was "No program is operating."

On the other hand, the forty principals of the forty-seven serviced schools, who responded to the questionnaire, had a different reaction. Thirty-two of them indicated that a program had been initiated but had not operated long enough to be evaluated. Of the remaining schools, 5 said that the program in operation was gaining acceptance by the staff and children and 3 reported that an excellent program was well established.

The need for a corrective reading program has been expressed strongly in questionnaire after questionnaire. Most principals were enthusiastic about having this kind of help or the prospects of getting it in the near future. A favorable attitude was reflected by principals who have had a corrective reading teacher in remarks such as these:

> Glad to have the program...Hope it will continue....enthusiastic because of the great need....extremely grateful... overjoyed...delighted...most vital project...beneficial and

enjoyable...Children and school will benefit a great deal...a most vital service...Continue as inaugurated...We hope this service will begin the first week of school in September and continue for complete semesters...We appreciate the service so much.

Those who have not had such a teacher wrote numerous remarks such as the samples presented here:

If nothing else is acquired through federal or state aid, I hope a corrective reading teacher is...

The children in placement here are underprivileged, dependent, and neglected. It is my firm hope that a corrective reading program will be implemented here during the regular school day.

In order to have an effective reading program, children must receive these services in their own school.

A sincere and hearty welcome for one who will come with a strong desire and a willing heart determined not to be discouraged for the first few days.

A remedial reading teacher is more necessary in our school than in any other one. Students come from Greece and speak Greek at home. They need corrective reading, accent, sound, and intonation according to American phonetics....

We would welcome a reading teacher for the only time the children hear English spoken is in the classroom....

Many of our children are reading below grade level and this accounts for poor work in geography, history, and other subjects.

I would say that on the average there are about 20 in every class who are approximately one to one-and-a-half years below grade level. Even to work with the slowest in every class for one half hour daily would require the service of one teacher and the three hour part-time service of another.....

A corrective reading program is of the greatest necessity in our school.

We are in great need of such a program as our students' reading levels are terribly below par.....

> If we could get such a program in operation, it would be of great benefit to all our boys....
>
> We're anxious to get this program started and will do all in our power to cooperate.....
>
> We'll welcome and appreciate the services and hope we can cooperate in every way....

Several principals called attention to the way energy is being diverted in other projects into many channels in dealing with the reading problems of children:

> High school students come to teach our children... We get help from a nearby college...Volunteer paren[illegible] teach some....Children go to a nearby public schoo[illegible]er school hours but are too tired by that time to pro[illegible] much by instruction.

They ask, "Is it not better to have the teaching of reading done in an organized way under the jurisdiction of a competently trained person in the school which children attend?" Essentially that is what this project aims to do.

Impatience with the administration of the project was expressed in various ways. Concern with the delay in starting the project was strongly expressed by some whereas others politely pleaded for the project to move faster.

> It should have started sooner....Children need this help.... We've experienced a great disappointment for we hoped to receive a corrective reading teacher and materials...We need a remedial reading teacher as soon as possible.... There is an urgent need for a reading teacher on a regular basis....We hope the program will soon start...We want a teacher badly as children need help badly.

Some felt a need for better rapport and understanding. This was best expressed by one principal who wrote:

> There is a lack of awareness of our needs and individual problems. There are no competent channels for transmission of problems...I have found myself unable to gain information. I called the coordinator's office a couple of times but received no call back....Obviously she is overburdened. Perhaps more assistance on this level is in order.

Another wrote:

> This whole program was thrown at us without giving time to make arrangements. Despite the inconveniences, the corrective reading teacher accomplished a lot in a short time and children will derive untold benefits from it.

There are a few principals, however, who are not sympathetic to the project. Two of them strongly emphasized the need for a project that focuses on the direct training of class teachers. One emphasized instruction in reading; another in teaching English as a second language. The theory behind this thinking is clearly expressed:

> If classroom teachers had adequate materials and were trained to use them, the need for a remedial teacher would not be so acute.

One would hold the class teacher responsible for remedial work as well as basic teaching. Another recommended smaller classes and reading groups to give the class teachers a better chance to succeed. One principal objected to having pupils taken out of classrooms. He expressed a desire for the principal to set up the program for his school in his own way even to the extent of managing the money for materials and supplies. Another would be content with sending pupils to a nearby school at three o'clock for remedial work to avoid breaking up the work of the class teacher.

Classroom teachers. The program has not been operating long enough for class teachers to react strongly. In one school where the program has been well established, the principal reported:

> Teachers have swarmed into the office to say this is what they dreamed of.

A report such as this shows what should be expected on a wider scale.

The reading teachers. In general, the reading teachers reacted favorably to the project. They referred to it as:

> excellent...a good project....helpful....much needed... a fine project extended to children who would otherwise never be reached...a most worthwhile project and once it is really underway much can be gained from it...much needed by children who speak English as a second language... meets a crying need for children in classes of 50-60 pupils who can get little individual help.

They were excited to be part of it....happy about it. Some wondered why it had never been considered before. Some claimed that improvement was shown even in the little time the project has been operating. As might also be expected, an occasional teacher dropped out. Reasons are unknown.

Children. When the observers met with children, they found them to be in various stages of receptivity. Some showed more interest and initiative than others. This may be due to the fact that some teachers had barely started to work with children. The children knew why they were being instructed and could give illustrations of some procedures used to help them improve. Only occasionally did one refer to reading at home. Most of them wanted help in reading, but some frankly expressed a desire to be somewhere else. Some of the children didn't like being away from other class activities, such as art and gym. Some appeared frustrated in trying to read materials too difficult for them. Boys were sometimes less favorable

to continuing the work than girls.

It is interesting to note that when asked what they would like to do next year, many children indicated related language activities such as word study and dictionary work, writing poems and compositions, dramatizing stories, spelling, and the like in addition to playing reading games and reading magazines and newspapers. Some were very enthusiastic about books that dealt with hobbies and science fiction and wanted more of them.

Principals reported that children look forward to the lesson... seem warm and appreciative...like it....are interested and pleased. They like the remedial reading classes and have shown improvement.

Parents. Children's reaction to how well the parents accept the program was reported in these words by observers:

> Mother is glad the teacher's here so I can learn to read better...Mother is happy but wants me to go to summer school...Mother says I'll surprise Daddy by the way I read...or...Haven't told Mother yet.

In general, observers found a variation among schools regarding the extent to which parents had been informed about the program. Principals reported that:

> Parents will be enthusiastic if the scholarship of their children improves....Pupils' parents are anxious to see such a program functioning.

Public and non-public school relationships. Basic to the acceptance of any program is the nature of the relationships that exist among the people engaged in it. One principal wrote:

> It has been evident that a favorable rapport has been established between public and non-public schools....

Comments of principals, teachers, and observers appear to indicate that at least three types of situations exist.

In the first type, the principal assumes responsibility for assisting reading teachers and class teachers to work together cooperatively and for keeping parents informed concerning the project. The teacher assigned is competent and earns the respect of persons with whom she works. Principal, reading teachers, and class teachers have mutual respect for each other, common goals and a fairly common philosophy with respect to the reading program. The principal keeps abreast of what is going on and is anxious to have good aspects of the program permeate the regular classrooms. Channels of communication are open within the school, with the Board of Education, and with parents. Principals wrote of reading teachers in these situations thus:

> Untiring in her efforts...fine and dedicated...conscientious, vibrant, resourceful, understanding...well organized and efficient....pleasant to work with...cooperative... highly industrious...anxious to help children....experienced and capable...We are pleased with the very fine reading teacher assigned...she is pleasant to work with, well organized and efficient...We are pleased and grateful to have experienced, capable, and most cooperative corrective reading teacher...We are extremely pleased and grateful for the services of the teacher assigned. She is dedicated and wonderful as a teacher, and in a short time has achieved much more for and with these children.

Teachers spoke and wrote of such schools as being:

> Cooperative...receptive...a place in which a teacher derives great personal satisfaction from working with children because of favorable attitudes toward people.

> The teaching staff is most hospitable, most eager to help and be helped. With equipment, time, and a developing program much good should result.

They felt welcomed by class teachers and pupils alike and referred to an atmosphere of mutual understanding. In such schools, the principal and his staff have set a favorable tone for a new project.

In a second type of situation, the principal may display a willingness to have outside people do something or express a desire "to give the reading teacher full reign." There may be no evidence of resistance; neither is there much positive help nor concern that practices introduced by the reading teacher become part of classroom teachers' practices. Or the teacher may not be the type who can make her influence felt. Whatever the causes may be, there are some shortcomings in the program which are expressed here:

> Frequent contacts between class teachers and corrective reading teachers would be helpful....At this rate there will be no carry over...There is a question as to whether teachers will carry on the work in the classroom as started with the children.

In a third type of situation, communication is inadequate and rapport is not at a high level. Displeasure with the administration of the project or resistance to it as it is operating is openly expressed. Resistance on the part of a few principals has been previously described. Of this type of school, teachers' comments were:

> I went to the school on a day that it was closed... The school is not interested in what is going on.

A principal wrote that a teacher was assigned without notification and he was not prepared to receive her. Another frankly wrote:

> Coordinating this and other programs within the school is very time consuming. I am quite overburdened and do not visualize myself continuing this type of activity

> for a full year. I believe that a coordinator from the school staff should work on the administrative problems of the remedial teachers within this school. The major problem is the Board of Education's closing its eyes to the reality of our program. General studies begin at 1 o'clock. Services should be provided on the basis of hours needed, not the hours available.

This third type of situation is the exception rather than the rule.

More study should be made of the climate in which reading teachers work and the kind of training that can be given to them to foster a wholesome atmosphere. Obviously, the principal of the school should be recognized as a key person in promoting the program and promoting the proper relationships. An institute for principals as well as leaders of classroom teachers may be advisable.

FUTURE PROSPECTS, QUESTIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

The need for this project has been established beyond a doubt as has also the willingness of most schools to cooperate fully. So the third objective of this interim evaluation becomes worthy of consideration. Attention is now directed to looking at the future of the project and suggestions for improving it.

In general, principals expressed optimism about the future of the project. They made comments such as these:

> We feel sure that the September term will see an excellently established program in our school...So far as we can see this program will accomplish a lot in our school....We look for a continuation as it has been inaugurated...The teacher assigned was most cooperative and anxious to begin teaching in earnest in September...The program seems promising, but it must be implemented on a more regular basis and for a longer period. Two days is too little time for the needs of our children.....

> The program seems very promising...Great interest was evinced by the teacher and very favorable response by the children...We surely desire the program, and of course we expect it will be a success when it is in operation. It should begin as soon as possible in September.

There is even some evidence that this project may be an activity which leads to further activity on the part of schools. It has been an impetus for some schools to do more on their own. One such illustration was described by a principal in these words:

> We hope to organize a central library. This is the room where the corrective reading class will be held.

Comments of the reading teachers read:

> The program will be a great success next year as it has already been well organized....It has great possibilities if it is administered correctly...It has every opportunity to succeed if adequate materials are provided as well as adequate work space in schools.

To observers and analysts of questionnaires, the success of the program depends largely upon its administration, the selection and placement of teachers, the nature of equipment and materials supplied to schools, and the education and supervision of teachers.

Administration. The first question to be asked concerns the budget. Has a satisfactory proportion of the budget been allotted for the administration and supervision of this project? Principals and reading teachers have pointed to the heavy responsibilities attached to the Director's office where the facilities and staff are limited. Some of these responsibilities include: (a) locating competent teachers to serve, (b) interviewing them, (c) orienting them to the program and providing training in the specific work to be done, (d) keeping lines of communication open between public and non-public schools, (e) surveying the existing situations in 130 schools heretofore little known to public school personnel, (f) supervising the activities

of the reading teachers whose backgrounds are widely different, (g) keeping time records, (h) conferrring with an outside evaluation agency, (i) surveying the need for materials, and (j) ordering materials as well as checking on arrivals.

Then, too, how much secretarial service should be available: Does the Director need additional aid? Is the telephone service adequate? In the words of one reading teacher, "If you want teachers to be able to reach the office by phone, you may need more office staff and phones." If the schools are to be dealt with individually, as they request, in the ordering of materials, in educating teachers, and in the placement of teachers to suit their time and their conditions, more staff will definitely be needed.

What are the plans for keeping communication between public and non-public schools wide open on this project? Will there be written communications to principals? Meetings for them? Meetings for class teachers and reading teachers? How often? What use will be made of newer media?

If there is a shortage of teachers in September which schools shall be serviced last? The few principals who are not in sympathy with the project might set up different types of projects in their schools with the help of colleges. Some of them have good ideas, worthy of exploration. Thus they would have a chance to carry out their own philosophy and to work more creatively in their schools. One, in particular, would like to attack the whole problem by up-grading class teaching first to reduce the number of remedial cases to be handled. The principal who would prefer to send his children to after-school centers for help might do that. Service to those schools

which are seriously overcrowded, on part-time sessions, and unable to privde working space for a reading teacher might also be postponed. At some future time, protable kits and temporary buildings may be provided for them. Under poor working conditions a teacher's efficiency is significantly reduced. This project should, therefore, aim at setting up good learning and teaching conditions.

What provision will be made to help principals meet problems about which they are concerned in relation to (a) transciency as it affects reading instruction, (b) the foreign speaking children, (c) the extension of the program to grades 8 and 9, (d) teaching phonics in first grade, (e) concentration on remedial work in grade two where one reading teacher claimed to have greatest success?

Perhaps as the program moves along it will be possible to do what one reading teacher suggested, namely develop separate programs for primary, intermediate, and junior high students and order materials geared to their reading levels. Perhaps appropriate kits might be set up by levels.

Selection and placement of teachers. Are teachers being found during the summer months to fill the vacancies which exist in two-thirds of the schools so that the program can start in September when school opens? Will they be placed in schools at the time the schools need them and on the days when a room is available? Will schools be notified of their coming sufficiently in advance to get them off to a good start? Will they have sufficient courses and enough experience in teaching reading to enable them to give the help to classroom teachers that is called for in the project application?

The nature of equipment and materials. What criteria were established for the selection of equipment and materials in Kits A, B, and C? Will all of the equipment and materials in these kits be in the schools by September? Will they contain adequate materials to meet the diversified needs of these schools at all levels of instruction? If not, is there money available for reading teachers to buy what is absolutely essential? How will teachers get it? Will all material continue to be ordered from the Director's office? What role will principals and reading teachers play in planning future orders?

The reading teacher needs a comfortable and convenient place in which to work. If workroom space is not available in a school, can the children in such a school be sent to a neighboring school for help after school hours? Where will desks, lockers, and the like from Kit A be placed in such schools?

The materials of instruction are a crucial aspect of the program. Much thought and attention should be given to locating reading materials that best contribute to promoting established reading objectives by levels of development at which children are operating and to finding materials for teaching oral language for these same developmental levels. The principles of self-direction, self-selection, self-seeking, self-pacing, and self-evaluation should be taken into account in ordering materials for these children. Observers noted that the children they saw do very little free reading and home reading. Their interests in everyday living and books should be brought together. Schools should supply the kinds of reading materials which good middle-

class homes customarily provide for their children.

The survey shows that there is a great lack of dictionaries in these schools. Dictionaries are key books in word study and instruments for self-help and self-direction. Picture dictionaries can be used with young children to improve oral language and to teach reading and spelling. Regular dictionaries, through pronunciation keys, help children read new words. They also help them locate word meanings in order to understand what is read.

It seems as though schools should play a greater role in ordering, and that classroom teachers should have more instruction in the critical analysis of materials, their selection and use. Perhaps a central reading laboratory should be established in this city or in each of the city colleges to promote research in the use of reading and language materials with disadvantaged children at different age and developmental levels. At such a center, teachers might see what to order, learn about the advantages of using such materials with children, and be instructed in the use of materials. There should be much concern about materials for language and reading instruction that can be used together effectively by children at specific growth levels. Perhaps this means the organization of kits for specific levels described in the bulletin sent to all schools.

Sequential Growth and Development in Reading

The ordering of tests poses a similar problem. What is the place of informal textbook testing? What must teachers know to do it well? What additional instruments do they need? For what purpose? Should each sxhool have a file of a few important diagnostic tests to give teachers ideas concerning the testing that can be done? What procedures

should be set up for testing new children as they arrive in the school? Who should do it? With which tests?

In this project, the teachers themselves relied mostly on informal textbook testing rather than on commercial or standard tests. Reasons for this should be explored. It was probably the best procedure considering the pressures under which everyone worked. The question is, "What will happen now?" There are very good diagnostic instruments available. The reading teachers themselves should have access to them, and they should be made available to classroom teachers. Each school was to receive tests valued at $27.54. Three packages were general achievement tests and one was a reading test for upper primary grades. Are no reading tests considered necessary before or above this level? Has money been too limited to purchase others? Has it been established that these will meet the needs of all schools?

Education and supervision of teachers. There is great urgency for speedy action in educating reading teachers and supervisors of reading teachers. All possible resources should be drawn upon in developing a comprehensive educational program for the corrective reading teachers assigned to the project as well as classroom teachers in these schools, and in setting up institutes for supervisors or principals. Now that the needs of these children have been identified, delay is inexcusable. Here is a real challenge to public and non-public school personnel and to the colleges of this city. New media and new techniques of instruction which have demonstrated their value should be brought into full use for this purpose. To what extent can television be used in teacher training even before all schools have television sets? Demonstration with children in large auditoriums?

The overhead projector with transparencies, films, and other audio-visual aids? The New York City School System has already developed television programs for reading teachers which will provide a good start in the education of classroom teachers.

Due to wide variation in the background and experience of reading teachers and to the fact that most of them are operating on substitute licenses, much consideration should be given to their education and supervision. A few have enough background and experience to direct the project; a large proportion of them, however, may be seriously handicapped by preparation which is too meager to enable them to fulfill the objectives of the program without extensive college instruction. Perhaps some have already been encouraged to take college reading courses during the summer or in the September term. Reading teachers, expected to help classroom teachers to use newer methods and approaches to the teaching of reading, should themselves acquire a superior background in this field. It takes competent teachers to earn the respect of colleagues with whom they work. Usually teachers in such positions need help in the process of working with other teachers in the school as well as courses in the teaching of reading. To work in many of these schools, they also need instruction in teaching English as a second language. Some of these courses should concentrate on teaching children at specific levels - primary, intermediate, and secondary. Even a course as specific as "Teaching Retarded Readers in Grade Two" may prove to be exceedingly valuable. Grade Two may be the spot, as one teacher remarked, where "the greatest gains can be made in the shortest time."

Both teachers and principals are asking for a greater share in

the selection and ordering of materials. With this opportunity goes responsibility for the spending of money. In view of the fact that the current market is flooded with all kinds of new reading materials, colleges should play a more active role in educating teachers and supervisors in the purchase and use of materials bests suited to the needs of disadvantaged children, particularly those with serious language problems.

In-service instruction specifically designed for this project appears to be needed. Undoubtedly, a program is being set up by the Director for the next term. Supervision of teachers who lack experience in the corrective reading field is needed in diagnosing difficulties, providing remediation, and referring cases too difficult for them to handle.

Previously, in this report, it was suggested that better education of classroom teachers should reduce the numbers of children who need remedial treatment. This project, too, assumed that reading teachers would work with classroom teachers. Realistically, if a reading teacher carries a load of 150 of the school's most difficult cases, how much time will there be for her to work with classroom teachers? Until many of them acquire more background in the field, it may be necessary to look elsewhere for help in teaching classroom teachers. Can a large-scale program be set up in September for this purpose? Some corrective reading teachers on the present staff are qualified to plan and carry out such a program. Perhaps some classroom teachers or key teachers in each school will enroll in college courses and as a result help other teachers. Planning is needed, however. Such matters cannot be left to chance. Is it part of a Director's job to initiate

and coordinate activities of this type?

Along with the education of corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers must go the education of principals or supervisors of instruction. In each school a principal or someone delegated by him should assume more and more responsibility for the total organization and supervision of their reading program in keeping with the needs of children in the specific school. Institutes for principals and supervisors should help them meet their problems, including those mentioned by them in their questionnaires. (page 31) Colleges are now offering Advanced Certificate Programs for persons interested in supervision.

As personnel from public and non-public schools work together on this project for the benefit of needy children and to promote a more integrated society, one of the most pressing problems is the development of leadership with deep concern for wholesome human relationships and an appropriate climate in which to work. Education for leadership should be a paramount goal of an in-service training program in this project.

SUMMARY

The interim evaluation of the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Regular Day Schools for 1965-66 has been concerned with (a) the extent to which an attempt was made to realize the objectives advanced in the project application, (b) the degree of acceptance of the program, and (c) its future prospects with suggestions for improvement. It is based on a questionnaire study in which 120 principals responded and one in which 40 reading teachers replied. These represent a ninety-

one per cent response to the questionnaires sent out. In addition, reports of five observers in ten schools were considered. They visited one fourth of these schools, selected at random.

There appears to have been great delay in starting the project. Intense activity began in May and extended to the tenth of June. During that time 44 corrective reading teachers were placed in 47 schools. A total of 1651 children were tested, and instruction started with 1148 of them. Since nine per cent of the questionnaires were missing, accurate figures would probably include nine per cent more. This is far short of the 130 schools the project was intended to service, the 93 teachers who were to be placed in schools, and the 13,950 children to be taught. Almost two-thirds of the schools were still waiting for teachers to be assigned when school closed in June. Materials listed in Kits A, B, and C were in the process of being delivered. No school reported the receipt of all of them.

The work of the Director appears to be very heavy. More help in that office should facilitate the program. Some teachers are highly qualified, but a large proportion seem to need more college courses as well as intensive training in corrective reading work if the objectives of the project are to be met. If there is a lack of qualified people in this field, colleges should be expected to assume more responsibility in educating people for these positions.

In spite of the delay, there is overwhelming evidence of the acceptance of this project from principals, reading teachers, and observers. A pressing call for help for needy children who have been forgotten in this city accompanies most of the questionnaires.

Appreciation is expressed for the intensive work of the Director over the last two months and for the services of the reading teachers, by those who have been fortunate enough to have them. Only a few dissenters are too overworked to take on responsibility for the new task, or have major projects of their own to promote, or find no place in their schools for a teacher to work, or prefer to send children to other schools for help after school hours.

Obviously, this is a project which should continue. It should have a chance to grow and develop into full maturity under the most favorable circumstances. The degree of success which the project will have is largely dependent upon its administration, the selection and placement of teachers, the programs of education and supervision to be developed, and the selection of equipment and materials with which teachers will work. Questions have been raised and suggestions have been made regarding each of these. A wholesome climate, marked by high level relationships between public and non-public school personnel is essential. Strong leadership by enthusiastic people who firmly believe that "We can overcome" will leave lasting "foot-prints on the sands of time" in the education of the disadvantaged youth in the non public schools of this great city.

A P P E N D I X

CORRECTIVE READING IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Research Director:

Dr. Margaret Parke, Professor of Education, Brooklyn College

Research Staff:

Dr. Celia Baum, Assistant Professor, Department of Education,
Brooklyn College

Dr. Vera Ohanian, Assistant Professor, Department of Education,
Brooklyn College

Dr. Irene W. Vite, Assistant Professor, Department of Education,
Brooklyn College

Dr. Ray Middleton, Assistant Professor, Department of Education,
Brooklyn College

Dr. Marguerite McNeil, Assistant Professor, Department of Education,
Brooklyn College

Research Assistants:

Miss Rosalind Millendorf, Graduate Fellow, Department of Education
Brooklyn College

Miss Edith Nunnally, Graduate Fellow, Department of Education,
Brooklyn College

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street, New York City

QUESTIONNAIRE TO PRINCIPALS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES PROJECT FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS

SCHOOL _____ ADDRESS _____

PRINCIPAL _____ PHONE _____ DATE _____

1. Has a reading teacher been assigned to your school by the New York City Board of Education Yes___ No___

   If you have circled NO, omit questions 2 to 6. Begin with 7

2. How many days does the teacher report per week?

   1 2 2 1/2 3 4 5

3. How many weeks has the teacher reported in the February-June term?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

4. How many pupils were tested for placement in corrective reading classes by grades?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total

   Who tested them?

5. How many pupils were selected from each grade for remedial instruction?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total

6. What test or tests were used to determine placements

   Informal textbook test_____ Others_____

7. Check the kits you received from Title I funds.

   _____Kit A _____Kit B_____Kit C

8. Check each type of material for reading instruction used in your school before Title I or Title II materials arrived.

_____ One set of basal readers per class.

_____Two or more sets of basal readers per class.

_____Library books in each classroom suited to the range of pupil abilities.

_____A good supply of library books in a school library.

_____Programmed materials such as SRA.

_____A picture dictionary for each pupil in the primary grades.

_____A regular dictionary in middle and upper grades for each pupil.

_____Weekly and/or daily newspapers.

_____Reading games, wood cards, charts.

_____A variety of diagnostic tests for teacher use.

Other: Indicate_____

_____

9. Check each item of equipment in your school before Title I or Title II equipment arrived.

_____Rexograph for teacher use.

_____Typewriter for teacher use.

_____Primer typewriter for teacher use.

_____Opaque projector.

_____Overhead projector and transparencies

_____Record player alone or with ear phones; records useful in teaching reading, literature, and spelling.

_____Tape recorder and tapes.

_____Machines for testing vision and learning.

_____Filmstrip projector.

_____Movie projector.

Other:_____

_____

10. Check the description which applies to your situation. Mark one

_____One room is set asisde for a corrective reading room. It is used for no other purposes.

_____One room is available for corrective reading on certain days or for certain periods of the day.

_____Cafeteria, halls, locker rooms or auditorium are to be used by the corrective reading teacher, but she will always work in the same place.

_____Working space shifts from one place to another during the day or week but the place where children work is always free from other distractions

_____The only space available is a corner in a busy office or classroom.

11. Check the standard test scores available for each pupil on your record cards in:

_____Intelligence

_____Reading

_____ Beginning and end of each term

_____ End of each term

_____End of certain terms (specify)_____

_____Spelling

_____Handwriting

_____Composition

_____History, geography, and science

_____Mathematics

12. What is your reaction to the corrective reading program? Circle one number which stands for the best description for your school.

1	2	3	4	5
No program is operating	A program has been initiated but has not been operating long enough to be evaluated	A moderately acceptable program is operating	The program in operation is gaining acceptance by the staff and children	An excellent program is well established.

COMMENTS:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Appendix E

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluation

QUESTIONNAIRE TO TEACHERS IN THE CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES PROJECT FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

Directions

Draw a line under the number on the right side of the page which best describes each item. In some cases, a scale beneath the item shows what the number means.

Employment

1. How many weeks have you been employed? 1 2 3 4 5
2. How many schools do you serve? 1 2 3 4 5
3. How many days per week are you in each school? 1 2 3 4 5

Background

4. Under which New York City teaching license are you working? 1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
Other: Indicate _____	Eatly Child-hood-Substitute	Early Child-hood-Regular	Common Branches Substitute	Common Branches Regular

5. In which age group are you? 1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
24 or below	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 or above

6. How many years have you taught? 1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
None	1 - 5	6 - 15	16 - 35	36 - 50

7. How many semester hours of college credit do you have in the teaching of reading? 1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
None	2 - 3	5 - 6	7 - 10	Above 10

8. How many in-service courses have you taken in the teaching of reading? 1 2 3 4 5

9. To the best of your ability, equate the number of semester hours of college credit you have for reading instruction gained in the integrated methods courses or language arts courses (consider the time spent in each course on the teaching of reading). 1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
None	2 - 3	5 - 6	7 - 10	Above 10

10. How many years of experience have you had in the corrective reading field? 1 2 3 4 5

Use of Paid Time

Indicate the extent to which you have performed each of these functions during the time you have been assigned to this Corrective Reading Project. The numbers on the scale stand for the percentage of time you spent on a given activity. For instance, if you underline 4, it means that you spent from 50 - 74 o/o of your time on that activity.

1	2	3	4	5
No time	1 - 24 o/o	25 - 49 o/o	50 - 74 o/o	75-100 o/o

11. Teaching children. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Testing children. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Attending in-service instruction designed for this specific program. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Meeting with teachers to learn more about children. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Consulting with parents of children taught. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Preparing for classwork and doing research. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Doing clerical work such as reports. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Ordering and/or distributing books, supplies, and equipment. 1 2 3 4 5
19. Setting up a room and organizing materials. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Conducting in-service instruction for this corrective reading program 1 2 3 4 5
21. Giving demonstration lessons. 1 2 3 4 5
22. Speaking to community groups about this program. 1 2 3 4 5
23. Others. Indicate:

_____

_____

_____

24. Check the kinds of records you keep:

_____Log of daily activities

_____Test scores and progress of each child

_____Library books read by pupils

_____Your attendance

_____Pupil attendance

Others:_____

_____

_____

25. What is your reaction to this project?

26. What suggestions can you offer for the improvement of the project next year? (Use additional sheet if necessary.)

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

33 West 42nd Street, New York, New York

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES PROJECT FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS
IN NON-PUBLIC REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS

Observer's Report

School_____ Address_____ Phone_____

Teacher_____ Principal_____

Date and Time of Visit_____ Observer_____

I. Conference with Principal

A. Evidence of attitude reflected toward the program.

B. Needs as he sees them.

C. Progress that has been made

II. Conference with the teacher

A. Number of children tested_____ Selected_____

B. Basis of selection

C. Conditions in the workroom; materials available

D. Review of records kept.

E. Attitude toward the program, school, pupils.

F. Needs expressed.

G. Progress made thus far.

III. Discussion with a representative group of children

A. Why do you meet with Miss or Mrs. _____?

B. What have you been doing to improve your reading?

C. What would you like to do next year?

D. What do your parents say about this project?

IV. Summary Comments (Use separate sheet if necessary)